

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

 APPLICATION NO.
 FILING DATE
 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
 ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

 09/176,374
 10/21/98
 TAKEUCHI
 E
 04645.0444

EXAMINER

IM22/0108 MARTIN G LINIHAN HODGSON RUSS ANDREWS WOODS & GOODYEAR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRACTICE GROUP 1800 ONE M&T PLAZA BUFFALO NY 14203

DOVE, T

ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER

1745

DATE MAILED:

01/08/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/176,374

Applicant(s)

Takeuchi

Examiner

Tracy Dove

Group Art Unit 1745

TH	HE PER	RIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]
	a) [expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	b) [<u>Х</u>	expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
	deterr	xtension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of mining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be ated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
	Appe perio	d for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
Ap bu	plicar t is No	at's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>29 Dec 2000</u> has been considered with the following effect, DT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
☑ The proposed amendment(s):		proposed amendment(s):
	X v	vill be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
		vill not be entered because:
		they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
		they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
		they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
		they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NC	DTE:
		pplicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 112 rejection of claim 1 and 35 USC 103 rejection over Binder, in view of Takeuchi have been overcome.
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.	
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:	
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	
X For		urposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	Claim	s allowed:
	Claim	s objected to:
	Claim	s rejected: 1-19
		roposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Examiner.
]	Note	the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).
X I	Other	The 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 5, 8 and 16 has been maintained because a curved surface cannot lie within a plane. The prior art rejection over Machida in view of Takeuchi has been maintained because there is motiviation to combine the references. Applicant argues neither reference teaches folding an electrode upon itself, however, this feature is taught by Machida.